DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – November 17, 2006

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Jerry Howard, California Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Martha Harnly, Department of Health Services (DHS-EHIB)
Tobi Jones, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Rebecca Sisco, University of California IR-4 Program
Barry Wilson, University of California Department of Environmental Toxicology (UCD)
Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Anna Fan, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Bryan Eya, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Joel Trumbo, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

Visitors in Attendance:
Denise Webster, DPR
John Sanders, DPR
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Ada Ann Scott, DPR
Rachel Kubiak, DPR
Joyce Wilson, Citizen
Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Assn.
John Paine, CAL/EPA Unified Program
Artie Lawyer, Technical Sciences Group (TSG)
Paul Hann, CVRWQCB
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
Angela Csondes, ARB/SSD
Alan Viets, Bayer Crop Science
Jeanne Martin, DPR
Randy Segawa, DPR
Jerry Campbell, DPR
Brian Bret, Dow Agro Sciences
Douglas Linscott, Dow Agro Sciences
Ann Pingitore, Schramer & Williams Consultant
Jim Wells, ESG
Tom Jacob, DuPont
Mary Grisier, U.S. EPA, Pesticides (Reg. 9)
John Hooper, CDFA
Dan Baldwin, Syngenta
Robert Schlag, OEHHA
Greg Clark, Napa Co. Ag. Comm.
Arlean Rohde, Exxon Mobil Chemical
Robert Baker, Clark Pest Control

1. Introductions and Committee Business - Tobi Jones, Chairperson

    a. About 39 people attended the meeting.
    b. There were no corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on September 15, 2006.

2. U.S. EPA's New Standards for Pesticide Containers and Containment: Mary Grisier, U.S. EPA Region IX

    Mary Grisier from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Region 9, and Nancy Fitz from the Office of Pesticide Programs at U.S.EPA Headquarters, gave a presentation on the new Pesticide Management and Disposal Rule that outlines new standards for pesticide containers and containment. The rule was finalized on August 16, 2006, and established requirements for pesticide container and design, as well as procedures for removing pesticide residues from containers prior to disposal or recycling. The rule also established requirements for containment of stationary pesticide containers and procedures for container refilling operations. The purpose of the presentation was to inform the Committee about the new rule, and to discuss the impacts of the rule to registrants, dealers, and applicators. Compliance/guidance documents are currently being developed by EPA, and as the role of EPA's State regulatory partners becomes more clear, further discussions will be held. The discussion also touched briefly on another new rule that EPA is working on to address Pesticide Container Recycling. This rule is expected to be published in summer 2007, and will require registrants to support container recycling programs. Retailers and pesticide users will be encouraged to participate.

3. Status of Eradication of Diaprepes Root Weevil – John Hooper, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)

    John Hooper discussed this new pest and CDFA's eradication program. The Diaprepes root weevil (DRW), *Diaprepes abbreviatus,* is a pest to ornamental plants and agricultural crops. It is native to the Caribbean Islands. The pest is currently established in Florida and is under eradication in a confined area of Texas. If the DRW became established in California, this pest could devastate residential landscapes and agriculture, most notably citrus. The DRW feeds on more than 270 species of plants from 59 plant families (Simpson et al. 1966). Because of its broad host range, this weevil poses a great threat to the ornamental plant and citrus industries in California. Important California crops that would be infested include avocado, citrus, corn, cotton, peaches, and sweet potatoes. This weevil also attacks ornamental plants such as roses, jasmine, hibiscus, palms, and camphor.

    In the fall of 2005, the DRW was detected in Newport Beach and in Long Beach. In the spring of 2006, DRW was detected in La Jolla. Subsequent infestations have also been found in: Newport Beach (west), Huntington Beach, Yorba Linda, La Jolla, Encinitas, Carlsbad,

Fairbanks Ranch, Oceanside, Del Mar, Sorrento Valley, and Carmel Valley. No trap lure exists for this pest; visual survey in conjunction with public reporting of this pest is the only detection method available.

Through a Finance Letter, one year of funding was granted ($6.5 million) to the CDFA to begin eradication, survey, and regulatory activities in Newport Beach, Long Beach, and La Jolla. These funds do not take into account the subsequent DRW detections. Additional funding will be sought to complete eradication efforts (estimated $ 25 million per year for 5-7 years) for the next fiscal year.

Current Status

The pest is under eradication, program activities are ongoing.

Activities to date:

- Science Advisory Panel was convened prior to eradication efforts. They recommended that CDFA attempt eradication, evaluating that eradiation is possible when infestations are less than a square mile in size.

- Survey/Public Outreach - Press releases and postcard mailers were sent to 1.7 million residents in 29 counties, plus visual surveys have been completed in 10 counties.
  - Results: Two additional infestations were detected in Orange County; five new infestations were found in San Diego County.

- Public meetings were held in most areas prior to treatment actions.

- Treatment activities are occurring in Newport Beach, Long Beach, La Jolla; Encinitas, Carlsbad, Fairbanks Ranch, and Carmel Valley. ***This includes smaller "Boutique" production citrus groves in San Diego County where DRW has been detected. CDFA is treating approximately 2500 properties total.***

- Regulatory activities include enactment and enforcement of quarantine laws in all infested areas. Additionally, regulations are being prepared in the event a nursery and/or a commercial production area falls within a quarantine boundary. **These quarantine measures will impact nursery operations in San Diego County (a nearly $1 billion local industry).**

- Diaprepes has been detected in one San Diego nursery to date.

Summary

CDFA will continue survey and eradication activates as long as additional funding allows. Treatments will end in early December and are scheduled to resume in March 2007.

4. Consultation on DPR's Recommendation on the Low Vapor Pressure Exemption for VOC- containing Pesticides Products – Randy Segawa, Environmental Monitoring Branch

Chair Jones opened this agenda item by indicating that DPR wanted to consult with the PREC on whether to adopt ARB's exemption of low vapor pressure compounds as a part of DPR's reevaluation on reformulation of liquid pesticide products. A draft recommendation was provided to the committee.

Under its Air Quality Initiative, DPR initiated a reevaluation to reformulate certain pesticide products and reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions. This effort is similar to the Air Resources Board's (ARB's) reformulation of consumer products, including pesticides in consumer products. ARB has a provision to exempt compounds in consumer products that meet its low vapor pressure (LVP) criteria: a vapor pressure less than 0.1 mm Hg at 20 C, or contains more than 12 carbons, or boils at greater than 216 C.

DPR staff have considered such an exemption for the pesticide products it regulates, but do not recommend adopting a LVP exemption for several reasons. ARB has considered, but not adopted a LVP exemption for other VOC sources it regulates, such as architectural coatings. Many products would drop out of DPR's VOC emission inventory, placing an undue burden on fumigants. Compounds, particularly pesticides that meet the LVP criteria are detected in air, causing an underestimation of the VOC emissions from pesticides. DPR's goal is to make an accurate estimate of pesticide VOC emissions, without underestimating the emissions. Adoption of the LVP exemption would not further this goal.

Committee members provided comments on the recommendation. Lyn Baker suggested some clarification in DPR's document on how ARB uses the LVP exemption for consumer products versus DPR product approach. Lyn indicated that ARB supported DPR's concept. He recognized the value of including liquid pesticide products in the VOC inventory and not relying solely on fumigants. He recommended further ARB discussions with DPR on approaches to this issue. Anna Fan indicated that OEHHA supported DPR's recommendation. In response to her question about the function that this exemption serves at ARB and its applicability to DPR, Lyn provided insight into use of the exemption in combination with reactivity (of VOCs). There was further discussion among committee members and Randy about reactivity and the absence of reactivity data on pesticides. Randy identified that pesticide formulations often contain mixtures of solvents, which complicates the application of an LVP exemption as well as considering reactivity. Jerry Howard asked about the alternative to DPR's

recommendation, and how to otherwise reduce VOCs. Syed Ali had provided written comments prior to the meeting.

Following the committee discussion, an industry representative offered to provide DPR with data on atmospheric availability of solvents used in pesticide formulations. There was a question and discussion about how to make DPR's approach more equivalent to ARB's approach to reducing VOCs for consumer products and consideration of VOC reactivity.

5. 2004 Emissions Inventory for VOC – Randy Segawa, Environmental Monitoring Branch

In October, DPR released its latest inventory of VOC emissions from pesticides. This inventory includes 2004 VOC estimates for the first time, based on the 2004 pesticide use report data. The inventory also incorporates new thermogravimetric analysis data to estimate the VOC content (emission potential) for approximately 700 products. Using this data, DPR has updated the estimates of pesticide VOC emissions for each year for 1990 through 2004. The most significant change caused by the new data was the reduction of VOC emissions from glyphosate products. Previously, most glyphosate products relied on a default assumption about their emission potential. The new data shows that the emission potential is at or near zero. The most significant change in VOC emissions from 2003 to 2004 was a 25% increase for the Ventura non-attainment area.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting - Tobi Jones, DPR

An update was requested on the Parlier Air Monitoring Project. Information was also requested on the new pesticide component of the State Implementation Plan.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, January 19, 2007, in the Coastal Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

7. Closing Comments - Tobi Jones

The meeting was adjourned.